## AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

## **Listing of Claims:**

| 1  | 1. (Currently amended) A method for using a computer system to solve a                               |
|----|--|
| 2  | global inequality constrained optimization problem specified by a function $f$ and a                 |
| 3  | set of inequality constraints $p_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$ $(i=1,,m)$ , wherein $f$ and $p_i$ are scalar |
| 4  | functions of a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots x_n)$ , the method comprising:             |
| 5  | receiving a representation of the function $f$ and the set of inequality                             |
| 6  | constraints at the computer system;  |
| 7  | storing the representation in a memory within the computer system;                                   |
| 8  | performing an interval inequality constrained global optimization process                            |
| 9  | to compute guaranteed bounds on a globally minimum value of the function $f(\mathbf{x})$             |
| 10 | subject to the set of inequality constraints;  |
| 11 | wherein performing the interval global optimization process involves,                                |
| 12 | applying term consistency to the set of inequality   |
| 13 | constraints over a sub-box X, and  |
| 14 | excluding any portion of the sub-box X that is proved to be  |
| 15 | in violation of at least one member of the set of inequality   |
| 16 | constraints; and   |
| 17 | recording the guaranteed bounds in the computer system memory;                                       |
| 18 | wherein applying term consistency involves:  |
| 19 | symbolically manipulating an equation within the computer  |
| 20 | system to solve for a term, $g(x_j)$ , thereby producing a modified                                  |

| 21 | equation $g(x'_j) = h(x)$ , wherein the term $g(x'_j)$ can be analytically                 |
|----|--|
| 22 | inverted to produce an inverse function $g^{-l}(\mathbf{y})$ ;                             |
| 23 | substituting the sub-box X into the modified equation to                                   |
| 24 | produce the equation $g(X'_j) = h(X)$ ;  |
| 25 | solving for $X_j = g^{-l}(h(X))$ ; and   |
| 26 | intersecting $X_j$ with the j-th element of the sub-box $X$ to                             |
| 27 | produce a new sub-box X +:   |
| 28 | wherein the new sub-box $X^+$ contains all solutions of the                                |
| 29 | equation within the sub-box X, and wherein the size of the new                             |
| 30 | sub-box $\mathbf{X}^+$ is less than or equal to the size of the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ .     |
|    |  |
| 1  | 2. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising:                       |
| 2  | linearizing the set of inequality constraints to produce a set of linear                   |
| 3  | inequality constraints with interval coefficients that enclose the nonlinear               |
| 4  | constraints;   |
| 5  | preconditioning the set of linear inequality constraints through additive                  |
| 6  | linear combinations to produce a preconditioned set of linear inequality                   |
| 7  | constraints;   |
| 8  | applying term consistency to the set of preconditioned linear inequality                   |
| 9  | constraints over the sub-box X, and  |
| 10 | excluding any portion of the sub-box X that violates any member of the ser                 |
| 11 | of preconditioned linear inequality constraints.   |
|    |  |
| 1  | 3. (Original) The method of claim 2, further comprising:                                   |
| 2  | keeping track of a least upper bound $f_bar$ of the function $f(\mathbf{x})$ at a feasible |
| 3  | point <b>x</b> wherein $p_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$ ( $i=1,,m$ ); and                          |
| 4  | including $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_bar$ in the set of inequality constraints prior to         |
| 5  | linearizing the set of inequality constraints.   |

- 1 4. (Original) The method of claim 2, further comprising removing from
- 2 consideration any inequality constraints that are not violated by more than a
- 3 specified amount for purposes of applying term consistency prior to linearizing
- 4 the set of inequality constraints.
- 5. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein performing the
- 2 interval global optimization process involves:
- keeping track of a least upper bound  $f_bar$  of the function  $f(\mathbf{x})$  at a feasible
- 4 point x;
- removing from consideration any sub-box for which  $f(\mathbf{x}) > f_bar$ ;
- applying term consistency to the  $f_bar$  inequality  $f(\mathbf{x}) \le f_bar$  over the sub-
- 7 box X; and
- 8 excluding any portion of the sub-box  $\mathbf{X}$  that violates the  $f_bar$  inequality.
- 6. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein if the sub-box X
- 2 is strictly feasible  $(p_i(\mathbf{X}) < 0 \text{ for all } i=1,...,n)$ , performing the interval global
- 3 optimization process involves:
- determining a gradient g(x) of the function f(x), wherein g(x) includes
- 5 components  $g_i(\mathbf{x})$  (i=1,...,n);
- removing from consideration any sub-box for which g(x) is bounded away
- 7 from zero, thereby indicating that the sub-box does not include an extremum of
- 8  $f(\mathbf{x})$ ; and
- applying term consistency to each component  $g_i(\mathbf{x})=0$  (i=1,...,n) of  $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})=0$
- 10 over the sub-box X; and
- excluding any portion of the sub-box X that violates any component of
- 12 g(x)=0.

| 1  | 7. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein if the sub-box X   |
|----|---|
| 2  | is strictly feasible $(p_i(\mathbf{X}) < 0 \text{ for all } i=1,,n)$ , performing the interval global                     |
| 3  | optimization process involves:  |
| 4  | determining diagonal elements $H_{ii}(\mathbf{x})$ ( $i=1,,n$ ) of the Hessian of the                                     |
| 5  | function $f(\mathbf{x})$ ;  |
| 6  | removing from consideration any sub-box for which $H_{ii}(\mathbf{x})$ a diagonal   |
| 7  | element of the Hessian over the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ is always negative, indicating that the                              |
| 8  | function $f$ is not convex over the sub-box $X$ and consequently does not contain a                                       |
| 9  | global minimum within the sub-box $X$ ;   |
| 10 | applying term consistency to each inequality $H_{ii}(\mathbf{x}) \ge 0$ ( $i=1,,n$ ) over the                             |
| 11 | sub-box X; and  |
| 12 | excluding any portion of the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ that violates a Hessian inequality.                                     |
| 1  | 8. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein if the sub-box X   |
| 2  | is strictly feasible $(p_i(\mathbf{X}) < 0 \text{ for all } i=1,,n)$ , performing the interval global                     |
| 3  | optimization process involves:  |
| 4  | performing the Newton method, wherein performing the Newton method  |
| 5  | involves,   |
| 6  | computing the Jacobian $J(x,X)$ of the gradient of the  |
| 7  | function $f$ evaluated with respect to a point $\mathbf{x}$ over the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ ,                               |
| 8  | computing an approximate inverse B of the center of   |
| 9  | J(x,X),   |
| 10 | using the approximate inverse B to analytically determine   |
| 11 | the system $\mathbf{Bg}(\mathbf{x})$ , wherein $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$ is the gradient of the function $f(\mathbf{x})$ , |
| 12 | and wherein $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$ includes components $g_i(\mathbf{x})$ ( $i=1,,n$ );                                  |
| 13 | applying term consistency to each component $(\mathbf{Bg}(\mathbf{x}))_i = 0$ $(i=1,,n)$ for                              |
| 14 | each variable $x_i$ ( $i=1,,n$ ) over the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ ; and  |

| 15 | excluding any portion of the sub-box X that violates a component.   |
|----|---|
| 1  | 9 (Canceled).   |
| 1  | 10. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising performing the   |
| 2  | Newton method on the John conditions.   |
| 1  | 11. (Currently amended) A computer-readable storage medium storing  |
| 2  | instructions that when executed by a computer cause the computer to perform a                                       |
| 3  | method for using a computer system to solve a global inequality constrained   |
| 4  | optimization problem specified by a function $f$ and a set of inequality constraints                                |
| 5  | $p_i(\mathbf{x}) \le 0$ $(i=1,,m)$ , wherein f is a scalar function of a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_n)$ |
| 6  | the method comprising:  |
| 7  | receiving a representation of the function $f$ and the set of inequality  |
| 8  | constraints at the computer system;   |
| 9  | storing the representation in a memory within the computer system;  |
| 10 | performing an interval inequality constrained global optimization process   |
| 11 | to compute guaranteed bounds on a globally minimum value of the function $f(\mathbf{x})$                            |
| 12 | subject to the set of inequality constraints;   |
| 13 | wherein performing the interval global optimization process involves,   |
| 14 | applying term consistency to the set of inequality  |
| 15 | constraints over a sub-box X, and   |
| 16 | excluding any portion of the sub-box X that is proved to be   |
| 17 | in violation of at least one member of the set of inequality  |
| 18 | constraints; and  |
| 19 | recording the guaranteed bounds in the computer system memory;  |
| 20 | wherein applying term consistency involves:   |

| 21 | symbolically manipulating an equation within the computer                              |
|----|--|
| 22 | system to solve for a term, $g(x'_j)$ , thereby producing a modified                   |
| 23 | equation $g(x'_j) = h(x)$ , wherein the term $g(x'_j)$ can be analytically             |
| 24 | inverted to produce an inverse function $g^{-l}(y)$ ;                                  |
| 25 | substituting the sub-box X into the modified equation to                               |
| 26 | produce the equation $g(X_j) = h(X)$ ;   |
| 27 | solving for $X_{i} = g^{-l}(h(\mathbf{X}))$ ; and                                      |
| 28 | intersecting $X'_{j}$ with the j-th element of the sub-box $X$ to                      |
| 29 | produce a new sub-box <b>X</b> <sup>+</sup> ;  |
| 30 | wherein the new sub-box X + contains all solutions of the                              |
| 31 | equation within the sub-box X, and wherein the size of the new                         |
| 32 | sub-box $\mathbf{X}^+$ is less than or equal to the size of the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ . |
| !  |  |
| 1  | 12. (Previously presented) The computer-readable storage medium of                     |
| 2  | claim 11, wherein the method further comprises:  |
| 3  | linearizing the set of inequality constraints to produce a set of linear               |
| 4  | inequality constraints with interval coefficients that enclose the nonlinear           |
| 5  | constraints;   |
| 6  | preconditioning the set of linear inequality constraints through additive              |
| 7  | linear combinations to produce a preconditioned set of linear inequality               |
| 8  | constraints;   |
| 9  | applying term consistency to the set of preconditioned linear inequality               |
| 10 | constraints over the sub-box X, and  |
| 11 | excluding any portion of the sub-box X that violates any member of the set             |
| 12 | of preconditioned linear inequality constraints.                                       |
| 1  | 13. (Original) The computer-readable storage medium of claim 12,                       |

wherein the method further comprises:

2

- keeping track of a least upper bound  $f_bar$  of the function f(x) at a feasible
- 4 point **x** wherein  $p_i(\mathbf{x}) \le 0$  (i=1,...,m); and
- 5 including  $f(\mathbf{x}) \le f_b ar$  in the set of inequality constraints prior to
- 6 linearizing the set of inequality constraints.
- 1 14. (Original) The computer-readable storage medium of claim 12,
- 2 wherein the method further comprises removing from consideration any inequality
- 3 constraints that are not violated by more than a specified amount for purposes of
- 4 applying term consistency prior to linearizing the set of inequality constraints.
- 1 15. (Previously presented) The computer-readable storage medium of
- 2 claim 11, wherein performing the interval global optimization process involves:
- keeping track of a least upper bound  $f_bar$  of the function  $f(\mathbf{x})$  at a feasible
- 4 point x;
- removing from consideration any sub-box for which  $f(\mathbf{x}) > f_bar$ ;
- applying term consistency to the  $f_bar$  inequality  $f(\mathbf{x}) \le f_bar$  over the sub-
- 7 box X; and
- 8 excluding any portion of the sub-box  $\mathbf{X}$  that violates the  $f_bar$  inequality.
- 1 16. (Previously presented) The computer-readable storage medium of
- claim 11, wherein if the sub-box X is strictly feasible  $(p_i(X) < 0 \text{ for all } i=1,...,n)$ ,
- 3 performing the interval global optimization process involves:
- determining a gradient g(x) of the function f(x), wherein g(x) includes
- 5 components  $g_i(\mathbf{x})$  (i=1,...,n);
- removing from consideration any sub-box for which g(x) is bounded away
- 7 from zero, thereby indicating that the sub-box does not include an extremum of
- 8  $f(\mathbf{x})$ ; and

| 9  | applying term consistency to each component $g_i(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ $(i=1,,n)$ of $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$     |
|----|--|
| 10 | over the sub-box $X$ ; and   |
| 11 | excluding any portion of the sub-box X that violates any component of  |
| 12 | $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})=0.$  |
|    |  |
| 1  | 17. (Previously presented) The computer-readable storage medium of   |
| 2  | claim 11, wherein if the sub-box X is strictly feasible $(p_i(X) < 0 \text{ for all } i=1,,n)$ ,                 |
| 3  | performing the interval global optimization process involves:  |
| 4  | determining diagonal elements $H_{ii}(\mathbf{x})$ ( $i=1,,n$ ) of the Hessian of the                            |
| 5  | function $f(\mathbf{x})$ ;   |
| 6  | removing from consideration any sub-box for which $H_{ii}(\mathbf{x})$ a diagonal                                |
| 7  | element of the Hessian over the sub-box X is always negative, indicating that the                                |
| 8  | function $f$ is not convex over the sub-box $X$ and consequently does not contain a                              |
| 9  | global minimum within the sub-box X;   |
| 10 | applying term consistency to each inequality $H_{ii}(\mathbf{x}) \ge 0$ $(i=1,,n)$ over the                      |
| 11 | sub-box $X$ ; and  |
| 12 | excluding any portion of the sub-box $X$ that violates a Hessian inequality.                                     |
| 1  | 18. (Previously presented) The computer-readable storage medium of   |
| 2  | claim 11, wherein if the sub-box <b>X</b> is strictly feasible $(p_i(\mathbf{X}) < 0 \text{ for all } i=1,,n)$ , |
| 3  | performing the interval global optimization process involves:  |
| 4  | performing the Newton method, wherein performing the Newton method   |
| 5  | involves,  |
| 6  | computing the Jacobian $J(x,X)$ of the gradient of the   |
| 7  | function $f$ evaluated with respect to a point $\mathbf{x}$ over the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ ,                      |
| 8  | computing an approximate inverse <b>B</b> of the center of   |
| 9  | J(x,X),  |

| 10 | using the approximate inverse B to analytically determine   |
|----|---|
| 11 | the system $\mathbf{Bg}(\mathbf{x})$ , wherein $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$ is the gradient of the function $f(\mathbf{x})$ , |
| 12 | and wherein $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$ includes components $g_i(\mathbf{x})$ $(i=1,,n)$ ;                                   |
| 13 | applying term consistency to each component $(\mathbf{Bg}(\mathbf{x}))_i = 0$ $(i=1,,n)$ for                              |
| 14 | each variable $x_i$ ( $i=1,,n$ ) over the sub-box $X$ ; and   |
| 15 | excluding any portion of the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ that violates a component.  |
| 1  | 19 (Canceled).  |
| 1  | 20. (Original) The computer-readable storage medium of claim 11,  |
| 2  | wherein the method further comprises performing the Newton method on the John   |
| 3  | conditions.   |
| 1  | 21. (Currently amended) An apparatus for using a computer system to   |
| 2  | solve a global inequality constrained optimization problem specified by a function  |
| 3  | f and a set of inequality constraints $p_i(\mathbf{x}) \le 0$ $(i=1,,m)$ , wherein f is a scalar                          |
| 4  | function of a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots x_n)$ , the apparatus comprising:                                |
| 5  | a receiving mechanism that is configured to receive a representation of the   |
| 6  | function $f$ and the set of inequality constraints at the computer system;  |
| 7  | a memory within the computer system for storing the representation;   |
| 8  | a global optimizer that is configured to perform an interval inequality   |
| 9  | constrained global optimization process to compute guaranteed bounds on a   |
| 10 | globally minimum value of the function $f(\mathbf{x})$ subject to the set of inequality                                   |
| 11 | constraints;  |
| 12 | a term consistency mechanism within the global optimizer that is  |
| 13 | configured to,  |
| 14 | apply term consistency to the set of inequality constraints   |
| 15 | over a sub-box X, and to  |
|    |   |

| 16 | exclude any portion of the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ that is proved to be in                |
|----|--|
| 17 | violation of at least one member of the set of inequality constraints                  |
| 18 | and  |
| 19 | a recording mechanism that is configured record the guaranteed bounds in               |
| 20 | the computer system memory;  |
| 21 | wherein the term consistency mechanism is configured to:                               |
| 22 | symbolically manipulate an equation within the computer                                |
| 23 | system to solve for a term, $g(x'_j)$ , thereby producing a modified                   |
| 24 | equation $g(x'_j) = h(x)$ , wherein the term $g(x'_j)$ can be analytically             |
| 25 | inverted to produce an inverse function $g^{-1}(y)$ ;                                  |
| 26 | substitute the sub-box X into the modified equation to                                 |
| 27 | produce the equation $g(X'_j) = h(X)$ ;  |
| 28 | solve for $X_j^i = g^{-l}(h(X))$ ; and   |
| 29 | intersect $X'_j$ with the j-th element of the sub-box $X$ to                           |
| 30 | produce a new sub-box X <sup>+</sup> ;   |
| 31 | wherein the new sub-box X + contains all solutions of the                              |
| 32 | equation within the sub-box X, and wherein the size of the new                         |
| 33 | sub-box $\mathbf{X}^+$ is less than or equal to the size of the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ . |
| ,  |  |
| 1  | 22. (Previously presented) The apparatus of claim 21, further comprising:              |
| 2  | a linearizing mechanism that is configured to linearize the set of inequality          |
| 3  | constraints to produce a set of linear inequality constraints with interval            |
| 4  | coefficients that enclose the nonlinear constraints; and                               |
| 5  | a preconditioning mechanism that is configured to precondition the set of              |
| 6  | linear inequality constraints through additive linear combinations to produce a        |
| 7  | preconditioned set of linear inequality constraints;                                   |
| 8  | wherein the term consistency mechanism is configured to,                               |

| 9  | apply term consistency to the set of preconditioned linear                                   |
|----|--|
| 10 | inequality constraints over the sub-box X, and to  |
| 11 | exclude any portion of the sub-box X that violates any                                       |
| 12 | member of the set of preconditioned linear inequality constraints.                           |
|    |  |
| 1  | 23. (Original) The apparatus of claim 22, wherein the global optimizer is                    |
| 2  | configured to:   |
| 3  | keep track of a least upper bound $f_bar$ of the function $f(\mathbf{x})$ at a feasible      |
| 4  | point <b>x</b> wherein $p_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq \theta$ $(i=1,,m)$ ; and to                     |
| 5  | include $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_bar$ in the set of inequality constraints prior to linearizing |
| 6  | the set of inequality constraints.   |
|    |  |
| 1  | 24. (Original) The apparatus of claim 22, wherein the term consistency                       |
| 2  | mechanism is configured to remove from consideration any inequality constraints              |
| 3  | that are not violated by more than a specified amount for purposes of applying               |
| 4  | term consistency prior to linearizing the set of inequality constraints.                     |
|    |  |
| 1  | 25. (Previously presented) The apparatus of claim 21,  |
| 2  | wherein the global optimizer is configured to,   |
| 3  | keep track of a least upper bound $f_bar$ of the function $f(\mathbf{x})$                    |
| 4  | at a feasible point $\mathbf{x}$ , and to  |
| 5  | remove from consideration any sub-box for which  |
| 6  | $f(\mathbf{x}) > f_bar;$   |
| 7  | wherein the term consistency mechanism is configured to,                                     |
| 8  | apply term consistency to the f_bar  |
| 9  | inequality $f(\mathbf{x}) \le f_bar$ over the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ , and to                  |
| 0  | exclude any portion of the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ that   |
| 1  | violates the f_bar inequality.   |
|    |  |

| 1  | 26. (Previously presented) The apparatus of claim 21, wherein if the sub-           |
|----|---|
| 2  | box <b>X</b> is strictly feasible $(p_i(\mathbf{X}) < 0 \text{ for all } i=1,,n)$ : |
| 3  | the global optimizer is configured to,  |
| 4  | determine a gradient $g(x)$ of the function $f(x)$ , wherein $g(x)$                 |
| 5  | includes components $g_i(\mathbf{x})$ ( $i=1,,n$ ), and to                          |
| 6  | remove from consideration any sub-box for which $g(x)$ is                           |
| 7  | bounded away from zero, thereby indicating that the sub-box does                    |
| 8  | not include an extremum of $f(\mathbf{x})$ ; and                                    |
| 9  | the term consistency mechanism is configured to,                                    |
| 10 | apply term consistency to each component $g_i(\mathbf{x})=0$                        |
| 11 | $(i=1,,n)$ of $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})=0$ over the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ , and to     |
| 12 | exclude any portion of the sub-box X that violates any                              |
| 13 | component of $g(x)=0$ .   |
|    |   |
| 1  | 27. (Previously presented) The apparatus of claim 21, wherein if the sub-           |
| 2  | box <b>X</b> is strictly feasible $(p_i(\mathbf{X}) < 0 \text{ for all } i=1,,n)$ : |
| 3  | the global optimizer is configured to,  |
| 4  | determine diagonal elements $H_{ii}(\mathbf{x})$ ( $i=1,,n$ ) of the                |
| 5  | Hessian of the function $f(\mathbf{x})$ , and to                                    |
| 6  | remove from consideration any sub-box for which $H_{ii}(\mathbf{x})$ a              |
| 7  | diagonal element of the Hessian over the sub-box X is always                        |
| 8  | negative, indicating that the function $f$ is not convex over the sub-              |
| 9  | box X and consequently does not contain a global minimum within                     |
| 10 | the sub-box X; and  |
| 11 | the term consistency mechanism is configured to,                                    |
| 12 | apply term consistency to each inequality $H_{ii}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$               |
| 13 | (i=1,,n) over the sub-box <b>X</b> , and to   |

| 14 | exclude any portion of the sub-box $\mathbf{X}$ that violates a                              |
|----|--|
| 15 | Hessian inequality.  |
| 1  | 28. (Previously presented) The apparatus of claim 21, wherein if the sub-                    |
| 2  | box <b>X</b> is strictly feasible $(p_i(\mathbf{X}) < 0 \text{ for all } i=1,,n)$ :          |
| 3  | the global optimizer is configured to perform the Newton method, whereir                     |
| 4  | performing the Newton method involves,   |
| 5  | computing the Jacobian $J(x,X)$ of the gradient of the                                       |
| 6  | function $f$ evaluated with respect to a point $x$ over the sub-box $X$ ,                    |
| 7  | computing an approximate inverse B of the center of  |
| 8  | J(x,X), and  |
| 9  | using the approximate inverse B to analytically determine                                    |
| 10 | the system $Bg(x)$ , wherein $g(x)$ is the gradient of the function $f(x)$ ,                 |
| 11 | and wherein $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$ includes components $g_i(\mathbf{x})$ ( $i=1,,n$ ); and |
| 12 | the term consistency mechanism is configured to,   |
| 13 | apply term consistency to each component $(\mathbf{Bg}(\mathbf{x}))_i = 0$                   |
| 14 | $(i=1,,n)$ for each variable $x_i$ $(i=1,,n)$ over the sub-box <b>X</b> , and to             |
| 15 | exclude any portion of the sub-box X that violates a   |
| 16 | component.   |
| 1  | 29 (Canceled).   |
| 1  | 30. (Original) The apparatus of claim 21, wherein the global optimizer is                    |
| 2  | configured to apply the Newton method to the John conditions                                 |